



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,931	09/22/2003	Poh K. Hui	N0469.70022US02	1625
23628 7590 12/16/2010 WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206				
EXAMINER				
KISHORE, GOLLAMUDI S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1612				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/16/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/667,931

Applicant(s)

HUI ET AL.

Examiner

GOLLAMUDI S. KISHORE

Art Unit

1612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 87-119 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 87-119 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment dated 10-18-10 is acknowledged.

In view of the inadvertent omission of claims 118 and 119 in previous office action, this action is made non-final.

Claims included in the prosecution are 87-119.

In view of the amendment to the claims, the 112, 1st and 2nd paragraph rejections are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 87-111 and 117-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nyberg ((5,677,472) in view of Kissel (4,863,740) or Papahadjopoulos (4,235,871) or Lenk (4,522,803) or Kikuchi (4,687,661) individually or in combination.

Nyberg et al. disclose methods of preparing phospholipids precipitates comprising mixing a phospholipids blend containing phosphatidylcholine, phosphatidylethanolamine, and sphingomyelin in an organic solvent mixture of polar organic solvent (e.g. methanol) and essential non-polar organic solvent (e.g. toluene), concentrating the solution, then add a second organic solvent of intermediate polarity

(e.g. acetone and heptane) to cause precipitation of phospholipids at about 13°-25° C, and drying the precipitate (see example 1, 2, 6, and claim 1). The concentration of sphingomyelins in the solvent is 2-20 mg/ml (column 6, lines 44-48). Nyberg et al. specifically indicate separation of phospholipids into different phases (column 5, lines 53-57; example 1, lines 56-67; and example 2). Nyberg et al further indicate the awareness of the use of the phospholipids in liposomal preparations (col. 1, lines 18-29).

Nyberg et al teach steps a, b and c. What is lacking in Nyberg is the teaching of the preparation of lipid suspensions or liposomes using the lipids of Nyberg et al and Unger (steps d and e).

Kissel teaches a method of preparation of liposomes (lipid suspension). The method involves dissolving the phospholipid (lecithin) in methylene chloride and adding an aqueous solution of a biologically active agent, IL-2 (Example B1 on col. 13). The lipids taught include phosphatidylcholines (such as dipalmitoyl phosphatidylcholine and sphingomyelin (col. 3, lines 1-51).

Similarly Papahadjopoulos teaches a method of preparation of liposomes wherein the phospholipids are dissolved in diethyl ether and adding an aqueous solution of the active agent (example 4 and claims). Various phospholipids could be used (columns 4 and 5).

Lenk similarly teaches a method of preparation of liposomes wherein the phospholipids are dissolved in an organic solvent and adding an aqueous medium (examples and claims). The lipids used include sphingomyelin (col. 7).

Kikuchi teaches a method of preparation of liposomes wherein heated propylene glycol containing lecithin or DPPC is added with an aqueous solution. Other solvents taught are polyethylene glycol and glycerin. Kikuchi further teaches sizing the liposomes using polycarbonate filters (col. 3, lines 33-46; examples and claims).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, if lipid encapsulation of an active agent is desired, to use the steps taught by Kissel or Papahadjopoulos or Lenk to prepare liposomes since it is an art known method of preparing liposomes. Although the references do not teach all of the non-aqueous solvents such as propylene glycol and their amounts, since the principle of precipitation is the same and since Nyberg teaches the use of suitable solvent systems (col. 3, lines 6-1 and col. 9, lines 54-57), in the absence of showing the criticality, it is deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any solvent which is suitable with a reasonable expectation of success. Similarly, since the purpose is to dissolve the lipids in a solvent, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use suitable temperatures to achieve the complete dissolution of the phospholipids. Applicant's claim limitation of sterilizing filter in claim 107 is noted. However, Kikuchi teaches the filtration of the liposomes using filters and this process results in sterilization. The examiner cites in this context, the reference of Papahadjopoulos (6,210,707) which teaches liposomal suspensions are sterilized when filtered through a conventional filter (see col. 17, lines 35-44).

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.
Applicant argues the following:

"With respect to the issues raised in the remainder of the rejection, the Examiner asserts that Nyberg discloses methods of preparing phospholipid precipitates and states at page 3 of the Office

Action mailed April 16, 2010, that Nyberg et al. "specifically indicate separation of phospholipids into different phases (column 5, lines 53-57; example 1, lines 56-67; and example 2)". Applicant submits that this teaching clearly distinguishes Nyberg et al. from the instant invention set forth in claims 87-111 and 117 and fails to support the rejection. In claim 87, the blend of the at least two phospholipids of (a) is precipitated out as a blend by contacting the non-aqueous solution of (a) with a second non aqueous solvent in step (b).

Independent claim 87 includes steps of combining at least two phospholipids into a blend of the at least two phospholipids. The at least two phospholipids of claim 87 begin as separate phospholipids and are combined in step (a) and precipitated out as a blend in step (b). The resulting solid collected in step (c) is a blend of the phospholipids that were combined, and there is no separation of the phospholipids from each other. Based on the claims and the teaching in the instant specification, it would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the process of claim 87 results in a blend of the two or more phospholipids.

The result of steps (a) - (c) of claim 87 would be in direct contrast with the outcome of the Nyberg et al. teaching. As concluded by the Examiner, Nyberg et al. teaches separating out lipids from naturally occurring mixtures thus resulting in lipids that are separate from each other. As stated by the Examiner, at page 3, Nyberg teaches a starting material that is a "phospholipids blend" that is exposed to solutions to separate out the phospholipids from the mixture into different phases. Clearly this does not yield a blend of the phospholipids. The Examiner's conclusion that the separation of phospholipids from each other into separate phases by Nyberg et al. as teaching steps a, b, and c of claim 87 is incorrect. From the Examiner's assertion that Nyberg et al. "specifically indicates separation of phospholipids into different phases" one must conclude that Nyberg et al. fails to teach or suggest mixing together individual, separate phospholipids to make a lipid blend and therefore, fails to teach steps (a) - (c) of claim 87."

These arguments are not persuasive. As pointed out above, the statements by Nyberg on col. 1 clearly imply that the phospholipids prepared by the process can be used for liposomal preparations. The precipitated fraction as evident from col. 7, lines 60-64 contains sphingomyelin, phosphatidylethanolamine and phosphatidylcholine and applicant is aware that these lipids are known to be used in the liposomal preparations. The secondary references clearly show that the liposomes are formed by dissolving the phospholipids in an organic solvent and mixing with an aqueous medium. Applicant has not shown that the instant liposomes formed by precipitating the individual phospholipid and then subjecting them to further dissolution in an organic solvent and the addition of an aqueous medium are patentably distinct from the liposomes formed by using the precipitated phospholipids of Nyberg, and subjecting them to the steps taught by the

secondary references. In the absence of showing such, it is the examiner's position that mixing individual phospholipids and subjecting them to precipitating them is an obvious parameter manipulated by an artisan. Applicant's arguments that the examiner has based the rejection, in part, on a conclusion that one skilled in the art would add two additional steps of dissolving previously separate phospholipids in three different non-aqueous solvent to make lipid blend and none of the references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests inclusion of these steps which are critical to the methods as claimed are not persuasive. As pointed out above, Nyberg's reference clearly indicates that he is aware of the use of phospholipids in the formation of liposomes and therefore, it would have been obvious to further subject the precipitated phospholipids to the steps necessary for the formation of liposomes since the secondary references clearly teach dissolving the phospholipids in a solvent and adding the aqueous medium to it.

Applicant's arguments that the secondary references do not teach combining at least two phospholipids and contacting the phospholipid mixture with three non-aqueous solutions followed by an aqueous solution as set forth in claim 87 are not persuasive. Kessel teaches a mixture of lecithin and phosphatidylserine in t-butanol and mixing this solution with an aqueous solution. As pointed out above, irrespective of how many times the mixture is precipitated, when it is finally dissolved in a non-aqueous solvent, the phospholipid mixture would be the same in a dissolved state compared to two phospholipids added directly to a non-aqueous solvent so as to dissolve them. Kessel, Papahadjopoulos, Lenk and Kikuchi (which have similar teachings) are combined for

their teachings of combining the non-aqueous solvent containing phospholipids to an aqueous solvent to form lipid suspension. As pointed out before, instant claims do not recite any specific amounts of individual phospholipids and therefore, the reference still meets the requirements of instant steps a to c. The examiner also points out that Nyberg also teaches the knowledge in the art of the use of phospholipids in the preparation of liposomes (col. 1, lines 18-30).

Applicant's arguments that Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Kikuchi and Lenk do not teach the missing elements of the claims as amended and that these references do not teach lipid blend prior to liposome preparation are not persuasive since these references clearly teach that either single phospholipids or mixtures of phospholipids are routinely used in the preparation of liposomes. These references show the use of pure phospholipids in the preparation of liposomes and applicant has not shown any unexpected results resulting from the use of an additional precipitation step by direct comparison using the pure phospholipids taught by Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Kikuchi and Lenk.

The declaration by Mark Watson has been considered, but is not persuasive. First of all, it just reports studies without any experimental data which can be evaluated. It is not clear from the declaration what phospholipid combinations were used and what they were compared with.

3. Claims 111-114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nyberg ((5,677,472) in view of Kissel (4,863,740) or Papahadjopoulos (4,235,871) or

Lenk (4,522,803) or Kikuchi (4,687,661) individually or in combination, further in view of Swaerd-Nordmo (6,165,442).

The teachings of Nyberg, Unger, Kissel, Kikuchi, Papahadjopoulos and Lenk have been discussed above. These references do not teach how to prepare liposomes containing ultrasound contrast agents containing perfluoropropane, that is, exchange air with perfluorohydrocarbons in a vacuum chamber.

Swaerd-Nordmo while disclosing vesicular preparations containing contrast agents teaches that the contrast agents can be incorporated by the exchanging perfluoropropane in a vacuum chamber (col. 3, Example 1). Various phospholipids which could be used are taught on col. 3, line 60 through col. 4, line 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of Swaerd-Nordmo to encapsulate perfluoropropane in the teachings of the primary references if the intended purpose is to use the liposomes for the delivery of ultrasound contrast agents since such a method is known in the art as taught by Swaerd-Nordmo.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. The examiner has already addressed applicant's arguments regarding Nyberg, Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Kikuchi and Lenk. Applicant argues that Swaerd-Nordmo fails to teach or suggest methods to make a lipid blend as claimed. The examiner once again points out that this reference is combined for its teachings of encapsulating ultrasound contrast agents; steps a-c are obvious over the combination of Nyberg with the secondary references.

4. Claim 115-116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nyberg ((5,677,472) in view of Kissel (4,863,740) or Papahadjopoulos (4,235,871) or Lenk (4,522,803) or Kikuchi (4,687,661) individually or in combination, in view of Swaerd-Nordmo, further in view of Unger (6,071,495).

The teachings of Nyberg, Unger, Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Lenk, Kikuchi and Swaerd-Nordmo have been discussed above. What is lacking in these references is the final sterilization of the product. Such a sterilization however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art if the preparation is used for human administration especially by an injection mode since sterilization of contrast agent containing liposomes by gamma-ray irradiation is known in the art as taught by Unger 6,071,495) (see col. 17, line 42 through col. 18, line 14).

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. The examiner has already addressed applicant's arguments regarding Nyberg, Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Kikuchi, Lenk and Swaerd-Nordmo. Applicant argues that Unger fails to teach or suggest methods to make a lipid blend as claimed. The examiner points out that this reference is combined for its teachings of sterilization; steps a-c are obvious over the combination of Nyberg with the secondary references.

5. Claim 117-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nyberg ((5,677,472) in view of Kissel (4,863,740) or Papahadjopoulos (4,235,871) or Lenk (4,522,803) or Kikuchi (4,687,661) individually or in combination, further in view of Unger 6,416,740.

The teachings of Nyberg, Kissel, Papahadjopoulos and Lenk have been discussed above. What is lacking in these references is the use of claimed lipid combination (DPPA, DPPE- PEG5000, and DPPC) in the preparation of the liposomes.

Such a use however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art with a reasonable expectation of success since Unger shows that this lipid combination is routinely used for the preparation of lipospheres (examples 3 and 12). Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. The examiner has already addressed applicant's arguments regarding Nyberg, Kissel, Papahadjopoulos and Lenk. Applicant argues that Unger fails to teach or suggest methods to make a lipid blend as claimed. The examiner points out that this reference is combined for its teachings of art known use of the claimed combination of the phospholipids; steps a-c are obvious over the combination of Nyberg with the secondary references.

6. Claims 87-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kissel (4,863,740) or Papahadjopoulos (4,235,871) or Lenk (4,522,803) or Kikuchi (4,687,661) individually or in combination.

Kissel teaches a method of preparation of liposomes (lipid suspension). The method involves dissolving the phospholipid (lecithin) in methylene chloride and adding an aqueous solution of a biologically active agent, IL-2 (Example B1 on col. 13). The lipids taught include phosphatidylcholines and sphingomyelin (col. 3, lines 1-51).

Similarly Papahadjopoulos teaches a method of preparation of liposomes wherein the phospholipids are dissolved in diethyl ether and adding an aqueous solution of the active agent (example 4 and claims). Various phospholipids could be used (columns 4 and 5).

Lenk similarly teaches a method of preparation of liposomes wherein the phospholipids are dissolved in an organic solvent and adding an aqueous medium (examples and claims). The lipids used include sphingomyelin (col. 7).

Kikuchi teaches a method of preparation of liposomes wherein heated propylene glycol containing lecithin or DPPC is added with an aqueous solution. Other solvent taught is polyethylene glycol. Kikuchi further teaches sizing the liposomes using polycarbonate filters (col. 3, lines 33-46; examples and claims).

In essence, these references teach steps d and e of claim 87. Instant steps a-c in claim 87 just recite re-precipitation of the lipids used in the formation of lipid suspension. The criticality of these steps is unclear to the examiner if one is using pure phospholipids just as used in Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Lenk and Kikuchi. Since the removal of impurities by precipitation is well-known in the art of chemistry, instant claims are deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The reference of Nyberg which teaches selective precipitation of sphingomyelins is already of record. Applicant's claim limitation of sterilizing filter in claim 107 is noted. However, Kikuchi teaches the filtration of the liposomes using filters and this process results in sterilization. The examiner cites in this context, the reference of Papahadjopoulos (6,210,707) which teaches liposomal

suspensions are sterilized when filtered through a conventional filter (see col. 17, lines 35-44).

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the references do not teach the preparation of lipid blend as claimed. The examiner points out that the use of pure phospholipids and their mixtures for the preparation of liposomes is clearly evident from the references and applicant has not shown that the step of precipitating the phospholipids and then re-dissolving them in a solvent prior to the addition of the aqueous medium for the preparation of liposomes is critical by direct comparison with the prior art preparation of liposomes using pure phospholipid mixtures. As pointed out above, when a phospholipid mixture is dissolved in a solvent, it is in a soluble state and this state will be no different from solution obtained by repeated precipitations of the same phospholipid mixtures. Applicant has not shown that the prior art lipid particles do not have the same properties as instant particles. Furthermore, applicant has not shown that one can obtain the same results using any two phospholipid mixtures.

7. Claim 117-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kissel (4,863,740) or Papahadjopoulos (4,235,871) or Lenk (4,522,803) or Kikuchi (4,687,661) individually or in combination as set forth above, further in view of Unger WO 96/40285 of record.

The teachings of Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Lenk and Kikuchi have been discussed above. What is lacking in these references is the use of claimed lipid combination (DPPA, DPPE- PEG-5000, and DPPC) in the preparation of the liposomes.

Unger teaches the use of DPPA, DPPE-PEG-5000 and DPPC. Unger also teaches the hydration of these lipids using saline, propylene glycol and glycerol (Example 6).

Such a use however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art with a reasonable expectation of success since Unger shows that this lipid combination is routinely used for the preparation of lipospheres (examples 3 and 12).

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. The examiner has already addressed applicant's arguments regarding Kissel, Kikuchi, Papahadjopoulos and Lenk. Applicant argues that Unger fails to teach or suggest methods to make a lipid blend as claimed. The examiner points out that this reference is combined for its teachings of art known use of the claimed combination of the phospholipids.

8. Claims 87-111 and 117 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munechika (5,662,931) in combination with Kissel (4,863,740) or Papahadjopoulos (4,235,871) or Lenk (4,522,803) or Kikuchi (4,687,661) individually or in combination.

Munechika discloses a method of preparation of liposomes. The method involves dissolving the lipids in an organic solvent, precipitating the lipids using a second organic solvent and hydrating the precipitate with an aqueous solution to form liposomes (col. 2, line 8 through col. 3, line 61 and examples). Munechika differs from instant method in that the precipitate is directly added to the hydrating medium instead of dissolving again in an organic solvent and adding the hydrating aqueous solution.

Kissel teaches a method of preparation of liposomes (lipid suspension). The method involves dissolving the phospholipid (lecithin) in methylene chloride and adding an aqueous solution of a biologically active agent, IL-2 (Example B1 on col. 13). The lipids taught include phosphatidylcholines and sphingomyelin (col. 3, lines 1-51).

Similarly Papahadjopoulos teaches a method of preparation of liposomes wherein the phospholipids are dissolved in diethyl ether and adding an aqueous solution of the active agent (example 4 and claims). Various phospholipids could be used (columns 4 and 5).

Lenk similarly teaches a method of preparation of liposomes wherein the phospholipids are dissolved in an organic solvent and adding an aqueous medium (examples and claims). The lipids used include sphingomyelin (col. 7).

Kikuchi teaches a method of preparation of liposomes wherein heated propylene glycol containing lecithin or DPPC is added with an aqueous solution. Other solvent taught is polyethylene glycol. Kikuchi further teaches sizing the liposomes using polycarbonate filters (col. 3, lines 33-46; examples and claims).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to dissolve the precipitate containing the lipids in an organic medium again and adding the aqueous medium to this solution with a reasonable expectation of success since the references of Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Lenk and Kikuchi all show that this method is a routinely practiced method in the preparation of liposomes.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Munechika describes making an emulsion that includes dissolving

the lipid in a first organic solvent that is immiscible in water followed by adding a drug containing aqueous solution to the dissolved lipid and forming an emulsion. These arguments are not persuasive since instant language 'comprising' does not exclude water to form an emulsion. Munechika essentially teaches the precipitation of the lipid mixture, followed by dissolving in an organic solvent and the addition of aqueous solution. Therefore, the reference still meets the requirements of recited steps with comprising language. The Dissolving the phospholipid mixture and adding the aqueous solvent is taught by the secondary references.

9. Claims 112-114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munechika (5,662,931) in combination with Kissel (4,863,740) or Papahadjopoulos (4,235,871) or Lenk (4,522,803) or Kikuchi (4,687,661) individually or in combination as set forth above, further in view of Swaerd-Nordmo (6,165,442).

The teachings of Munechika, Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Kikuchi and Lenk have been discussed above. These references do not teach how to prepare liposomes containing ultrasound contrast agents containing perfluoropropane, that is, exchange air with perfluorohydrocarbons in a vacuum chamber.

Swaerd-Nordmo while disclosing vesicular preparations containing contrast agents teaches that the contrast agents can be incorporated by the exchanging perfluoropropane in a vacuum chamber (col. 3, Example 1). Various phospholipids which could be used are taught on col. 3, line 60 through col. 4, line 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of Swaerd-Nordmo to encapsulate perfluoropropane in the teachings of the primary

references if the intended purpose is to use the liposomes for the delivery of ultrasound contrast agents since such a method is known in the art as taught by Swaerd-Nordmo.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. The examiner has already addressed applicant's arguments regarding Munechika, Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Lenk and Kikuchi. Applicant's only argument is that the addition of the teaching of Swaerd-Nordmo to the combination of the references does not teach or suggest each element of the claimed invention. This argument is not persuasive since this reference is combined for its teaching of contrast agents.

10. Claims 115-116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munechika (5,662,931) in combination with Kissel (4,863,740) or Papahadjopoulos (4,235,871) or Lenk (4,522,803) or Kikuchi (4,687,661) individually or in combination in view of Swaerd-Nordmo (6,165,442) as set forth above, further in view of Unger (6,071,495).

The teachings of Munechika, Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Kikuchi, Lenk and Swaerd-Nordmo have been discussed above. What is lacking in these references is the final sterilization of the product. Such a sterilization however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art if the preparation is used for human administration especially by an injection mode since sterilization of contrast agent containing liposomes by gamma-ray irradiation is known in the art as taught by Unger (6,071,495) (see col. 17, line 42 through col. 18, line 14).

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. The examiner has already addressed applicant's arguments regarding Munechika, Kissel,

Papahadjopoulos, Lenk, Kikuchi and Swaerd-Nordmo. Applicant's only argument is that the addition of the teaching of Unger to the combination of the references does not teach or suggest each element of the claimed invention. This argument is not persuasive since this reference is combined for its teaching of sterilization process and not for steps a-c.

11. Claim 117-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munechika (5,662,931) in combination with Kissel (4,863,740) or Papahadjopoulos (4,235,871) or Lenk (4,522,803) or Kikuchi (4,687,661) individually or in combination as set forth above, further in view of Unger WO 96/40285 of record.

The teachings of Munechika, Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Kikuchi and Lenk have been discussed above. What is lacking in these references is the use of claimed lipid combination (DPPA, DPPE- PEG5000, and DPPC) in the preparation of the liposomes.

Unger teaches the use of DPPA, DPPE-PEG-5000 and DPPC. Unger also teaches the hydration of these lipids using saline, propylene glycol and glycerol (Example 6).

Such a use however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art with a reasonable expectation of success since Unger shows that this lipid combination is routinely used for the preparation of lipospheres (examples 3 and 12).

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. The examiner has already addressed applicant's arguments regarding Munechika, Kissel, Papahadjopoulos, Lenk and Kikuchi. Applicant's only argument is that the addition of the teaching of Unger to the combination of the references does not teach or suggest

each element of the claimed invention. This argument is not persuasive since this reference is combined for its teaching of the claimed combination of lipids for the liposomal preparations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GOLLAMUDI S. KISHORE whose telephone number is (571)272-0598. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM- 4 PM, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krass Frederick can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gollamudi S Kishore/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612

GSK

